DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 426 444 EA 029 248

AUTHOR Dixon, Douglas A.
TITLE Lessons for "Community" Democratic School Reformers from "Publius" and Friends.
PUB DATE 1998-04-00
NOTE 49p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Diego, CA, April 13-17, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; *Constitutional History; Decision Making; *Democratic Values; Educational Administration; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Participative Decision Making; Political Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Federalist Papers; *Founding Fathers of the United States

ABSTRACT

Recent efforts to improve schools through community democratic school decision making and practices conflict with ideas of some of the founding fathers of the U.S. Constitution. There are several differences between the ideas of some contemporary democratic education reformers and those of Publius (the pen name of the authors of the Federalist Papers--Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay). The paper describes the reform structures, principles, and practices promoted by three democratic school leaders: Glickman, Levin, and Sizer. These educational leaders' ideas are then described within a framework of eight elements of democracy. Although present-day democratic- school reformers and the Constitutional advocates shared similar language, their words reflect substantially different meaning. Perspectives on the Constitution by Publius, representative of the liberal, democratic tradition identified in an earlier study, are presented and contrasted with elements of the community conception of democracy. Potential problems may arise if consumers of these educational reforms do not understand the conflict between the democratic-school reformers' ideas and those of the founding fathers and scholars of the Constitution. Publius's writings offer valuable lessons about the obstacles community democratic-school reformers face when attempting to implement their principles, processes, and governance mechanisms. (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 426 444

LESSONS FOR 'COMMUNITY' DEMOCRATIC SCHOOL REFORMERS FROM *PUBLIUS* AND FRIENDS

Douglas A. Dixon

Queens College-City University of New York

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, California, April 13-18, 1998

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Dixon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EA 029248

Lessons for 'Community' Democratic School Reformers from *Publius* and Friends

[D]angerous ambition more often lurks behind the specious mask of zeal for the rights of the people than under the forbidding appearance of zeal for the firmness and efficiency of government. History will teach us that the former has been found a much more certain road to the introduction of despotism than the latter. Alexander Hamilton, Federalist 1

Recent reform ideas (Glickman, 1993, 1998, Levin, in Hopfenberg et al., 1993; Sizer, 1996) to improve schools through implementing community democratic school decision making and practices conflict with the ideas of prominent founding fathers of the U.S. Constitution and some public administration scholars' interpretations of the Constitution. Some of these differences were noted in the discussion of two conceptions of democracy, liberal and community, in an earlier study (Dixon, 1997). Especially problematic for the consumers of these school reforms may be efforts to promote school-wide decision making within a small, heterogeneous community, to include all in the community in decision making (but especially those in the schools), to define problems based on input from everyone directly affected by those decisions (i.e., everyone has relevant and significant knowledge to contribute to problem identification and solution), to increase access and dissemination of information to everyone directly affected by decisions, and to restrict governmental oversight or involvement. Implementing a local school democratic system of decision making also reflects beliefs about human nature and value priorities not shared by leaders who advocated for the Constitution's adoption.

This paper explored contrasts between the ideas of some contemporary, prominent, democratic education reformers (Glickman, 1993, 1998; Levin, in Hopfenberg et al, 1993; and Sizer, 1996) and those of Publius (Hamilton, Madison, and Jay, in Rossiter, 1961) and friends--scholars on the Constitution and modern-day public administration. For example, while at times

these present-day democratic school reformers and the Constitutional advocates shared similar language, their words reflected substantially different meaning (e.g., a Constitution based on public support compared to constitutions adopted primarily by teachers and principal who 'reside' in the school; a community bound by law in contrast to communities bound by consensus, the former maintained through coercion, the latter reliant on good will and/or threat of job transfer; a clearly articulated distribution of powers versus a system fraught with ambiguity).

Initially, this paper draws a thumbnail sketch of the reform structures, principles, and practices promoted by three democratic school leaders: Glickman, Levin, and Sizer. These educational leaders' ideas are then described within a framework of eight elements of democracy. These educational leaders were selected based on their wide reaching reform networks, their explicit promotion of democratic school decision making practices, and the findings of a previous study, which categorized their reforms as reflecting primarily 'community democracy' (see Appendix, Table 2). Then, the paper provides perspectives on the Constitution by Publius and friends, reflective of the liberal democratic tradition also identified in an earlier study (see Appendix, Table 1). Finally, it elaborated potential problems faced by consumers of these educational reforms if they do not understand the conflict between the democratic school reformers' ideas and those of the founding fathers and scholars of the Constitution, which pervade much of the political environment of schools today.

School Reform and Community Democracy: Sizer, Glickman, and Levin

> Americans were still a peculiarly blessed and covenanted people; if they would but mend their ways and humbly acknowledge their God, good might come out of all this suffering [i.e., British tyranny]. As Isaiah warned, God 'sends his judgments abroad in the earth, that men may learn righteousness.' Gordon Wood, The Creation of the American Republic, 1776-1787

When examining several prominent and extensive democratic school initiatives such as the League of Professional Schools (LPS), the Accelerated Schools Project (ASP), or the Coalition of Essential Schools (CES), one cannot help but question the use of terms synonymous with Biblical lexicon. Glickman (1993) professed the necessity to establish a shared covenant in LPS reforms (pp. 15-27). Levin (in Hopfenberg et al., 1993) recommended that the local school community, in ASP schools, "forge a shared vision" (p. 74). Sizer (1996) characterized his school improvement program (CES) as Horace's Hope. It may not be accidental that the type of optimism and consensus that these reforms involve is not tied to a legal mandate through the electoral system. Building these reform governance structures, establishing their underlying principles and processes, and reaching their goals, may have more to do with establishing a community of believers than it does with creating a system designed to balance the goals of conflicting groups or values or to protect individual rights (Federalist Papers, in Rossiter, 1961; Gutmann, 1987; Truman, 1951; Yankelovich, 1991). It was, at least partly, these latter concerns that filled the minds of Madison, Hamilton, and other prominent founding fathers.

An earlier study (Dixon, 1997) discovered elements of democracy that may be contrasted across the ideas of current school reformers and those of the framers of the U.S. Constitution. This section identified eight elements of a community conception of democracy embedded in the writings of the three school reformers. These elements were explored in previous research based on content analysis of the most recent school reform ideas of Glickman (1993, 1998), Levin (in Hopfenberg et al., 1993), and Sizer (1996), among others (Dewey, 1916; Dryzek, 1996; Kerr, 1996; Putnam, 1995; VanSickle, 1983). These elements differ in fundamentally important ways from the liberal conception of democracy described in more detail below. The eight elements

included beliefs about human nature, government, participation, the nature of problems and knowledge, information access and dissemination, the boundaries of governing, and value priorities. The first of the elements, beliefs about human nature, appeared to be wedded to many of the other elements. In fact, the web these elements form may provide a clearer lens to understand the political culture of a particular school community. This is addressed in a separate paper (Dixon, 1998). The eight elements of democracy provided a framework to contrast these current school reformers' ideas to those of 'Publius and friends.'

Interestingly, the reform ideas of Glickman, Levin, and Sizer, all appeared to impute to human nature boundless potential for intellectual, moral, and emotional growth and self governance, though Sizer was less sanguine than the others. Sizer also criticized more extensively the efforts of elected and bureaucratic government (central district administrators) involvement in schools than did Glickman or Levin. Both Glickman and Sizer have concluded that capable school leadership is essential to establish the reforms they advocate. Levin's writings reflected most faithfully a belief in the ability of individuals in local school communities to identify and surmount challenges and build on strengths. Thus, the ideas of the community democratic reformers were not completely in accord. Nevertheless, they all suggested the bright prospects that a community democracy orientation could achieve in school outcomes. Below, a brief sketch of each of the school reformer's initiatives is provided. Then, the paper turns to how these reformers' ideas fit within the community democratic rubric of eight elements of a community conception of democracy.

Glickman (1993) described his democratic reform practices in terms of a three-pronged framework: a covenant, charter, and critical-study process (p. 67). The covenant encompassed

the principles of teaching and learning, which those within the school, primarily teachers, agree to support. For the covenant to reflect democracy, he maintained, its "core values" must reflect clear connections with "freedom, justice, and equality as well as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all" (p. 24). Glickman (1993) noted that covenant principles may come to fruition in domains such as "scheduling, curriculum, report cards, budgeting and staffing, [and] hiring" and "student assessment" (pp. 24, 68, 134). Other areas of school decision making (e.g., transportation) are excluded wholly, or only initially, because they are either not directly related to the principal focus (i.e., teaching and learning) or they require waivers from administrative or formally elected officials.

Glickman (1993) wrote that democratic decision making must include procedures to ensure maximum participation by those most affected by the decisions. He suggested that *since teachers are the "residents who live most intimately with the issues of the schoolwide teaching and learning," they should have the "majority voice on all decisions affecting their professional work*" (pp. 35, 137, italics added). Moreover, teachers are believed to possess much expertise. The school principal is also a key player in decision making because of his or her central role in coordinating and articulating school activities (p. 36). Students and other groups are important as well, and participants should reflect the diversity of the community. Glickman's (1993) guiding rule, however, is "everyone *can* be involved in decision making, no one *has* to be involved, and, once a decision is made, everyone must support it" (p. 98).

The second prong, democratic governance in LPS schools, may be structured in several different ways: representational, direct, or as a hybrid, the last is used commonly. Glickman (1993) described the hybrid structure as, in part, a small but representative "governing council"

that provides a small forum for addressing concerns voiced in the meetings of the task forces and liaison groups (i.e., all encompassing groups of school personnel essentially given a chance to share concern). The governing council consists of 'elected' at-large members from the school), with the exception of the principal who is an "automatic member," (p. 41) and a limited number of parent, community, and/or student representatives. The school establishes its priorities and task force focuses through governing council deliberations. The task force groups study issues and report their recommendations to the council. Task force membership is self-selecting. The council considers the recommendations as do the liaison groups. A final decision is made by either the council or the entire school body. Glickman (1993) asserted that democratic governance "strive[s] for decisions that focus on matters of schoolwide education, [that] are fair and equal and distribute power, and [that] are morally consistent with the school's goal of democratic engagement of students" (p. 42).

The third prong of Glickman's democratic reform initiative is "the critical study process" (p. 48). This process is primarily the information gathering stage of decision making. Participants are expected to seek out as much information from a variety of sources to identify problems and devise solutions. The process must also be guided by democratic values of justice, liberty, equality, among others. Thus, Glickman (1993) suggested that schools must ask potentially controversial questions such as "Why is there a disproportionate number of students of one gender or a particular ethnic or racial group in certain classes? Why are students at a particular grade who are taking certain subjects failing more than others? Why is the socioeconomic achievement gap getting wider?" (p. 52). Moreover, he suggested that those in the school community may be in the best position to provide critical data (p. 51).

Levin's Accelerated Schools Project reflects many of the features of the LPS approach discussed above. However, ASP schools are explicitly devoted to hastening the learning of 'at-risk' students. At-risk students are young children who are raised in an environment which does not provide for the "skills, resources, and experiences" that they need to succeed in traditional schools (Hopfenberg et al., 1993, p. 9). Having witnessed the disastrous consequences of remedial ('slower') school programs for these students, Levin formulated principles, processes and structures that he thought would reverse the downward learning spiral for at-risk students--infusing their school experience with a "faster rate" of instruction (p. 17).

The "overall goal" for members in the accelerated community, however, is making their schools serve all the students--"[c]reating schools for all children that we would want for our own children" (p. 20). This goal, in turn, is supported by three principles: "unity of purpose, empowerment coupled with responsibility, and building on strengths" (p. 21). The first principle rallies all members of the local community to strive toward a set of goals that everyone can support. The second principle refers to acknowledging that all participants in the local community can "make important educational decisions," that they can "share the responsibility for implementing those decisions," and that they "share responsibility for the outcomes of those decisions" (p. 24). Like the LPS reform, ASP schools should share in essential decisions such as "curriculum, instructional strategies, materials, schedules, personnel, [and resource allocation and organization]" (p. 25). Also, like Glickman, Levin recommends that the bulk of these decision areas be handled at the local school site. The third principle, building on strengths, entails using all the resources that the local community has to offer to the education of children (pp. 26-27). It also includes setting high expectations, while acknowledging the wide arrange of abilities and

interests that children bring to learning. In general, strengths refer not only to students, but to all in the community, and these need to be explored to their fullest in creating the maximum opportunity for learning.

All of the principles are undergirded by core values, again many reflective of the LPS attachment to justice, equality, and liberty, and the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. ASP core values include: equity, participation, communication and collaboration, community spirit, reflection, experimentation and discovery, trust, risk taking, and school as center of expertise (pp. 31-33). These values underscore the belief that all children can, and have a right to, learn in a rigorous program; all in the community should participate in the education of children; everyone communicates and collaborates in school activities and decisions; the school maintains strong connections across all in the community; there is time "to reflect, to do research, to work together, to share ideas" and to scrutinize current practices; participants are willing to take informed risks and experiment; trust among participants is in place; the participants have the expertise to improve learning.

ASP schools also have a local school shared governance structure, much like the LPS system. It consists of a "steering committee" (i.e., LPS governing council), "cadres" (i.e., LPS task forces), and "school as a whole" (or SAW). Levin (in Hopfenberg et al., 1993) described the governing process in the following way:

> [C]adres make their recommendations to the steering committee, where they're discussed and refined. These proposals are then included in the daily school bulletin so that all members of the school community can reflect on the proposals before discussing and voting on them at their monthly school-as-a-whole meetings. In this way, the steering committee serves primarily as a clearinghouse of information for cadre and staff concerns before the school as a whole votes on items that involve schoolwide changes in curriculum, instruction, or organization. (p. 48)

Before the governing process reaches an agreed upon action, the 'challenge focus' has been informed through much in-depth inquiry. More specifically, Levin maintained that the "Inquiry Process" includes a list of activities from "defining the problem (challenge), hypothesizing causes, suggesting and researching alternative corrective actions, and determining a 'solution' informed by all in the process (p. 49). He sums up the ASP process by elaborating several general stages taking stock, forging a vision, setting priorities, and creating a governance structure (pp. 56-57). A school cannot become an ASP school until the "entire school first decides together that it wants to become an accelerated school; full buy-in is crucial to such an all-inclusive process" (p. 57). Moreover, the staff and representatives from the local community much attend a 'launch' or training session to understand the project. Like Glickman (1998, p. 8), Levin (in Hopfenberg et al., 1993, p. 33) acknowledged the influence of John Dewey in the ASP's philosophy and reforms.

Sizer (1996) has described his school reform initiative in a different light than either Glickman or Levin, though the democratic core remains the foundation (p. 155). Responding to a question as to whether his reforms are principally elitist (i.e., focusing principally on the intellect), Sizer concluded that the improvements he advocated were "elitist only if one thinks that using one's mind resourcefully is the preserve of some special minority group. [The CES] view is that it is the right of every citizen and the ultimate bulwark of democracy" (Sizer, 1992, p. 232). Sizer's CES reform ideas require more local school interpretation than either ASP or LPS. His "Coalition of Essential Schools" (CES) movement embodied what he labeled "common principles" in an earlier work (Sizer, 1992), though he admitted that these were broad and that more might be added, the list was considered a work in progress. These essential principles were derived to overcome the teaching 'compromises' Sizer noted in his research into high school practices, and at least initially,

the lack of an "intellectual core" provided by traditional schools (Sizer, 1996, p. 153). The 'Horace' in Sizer's Horace's Hope was a fictional character, yet reflective of those real-life educators in high schools who face insurmountable obstacles to improve teaching and learning. The compromises were the teacher 'shortcuts' or variant practices to meet unrealistic 'external' demands, while trying (not too successfully) to provide adequate experiences for students.

The CES's nine common school principles include:

> The school should focus on helping students use their minds well, the school's goals must be simple, each student should master a number of essential skills and be competent in certain areas of knowledge, the school's goals should apply to all students, teaching and learning should be personalized to the maximum feasible extent, the governing metaphor of the school should be student as worker, rather... than teacher as deliverer of instructional services, the diploma should be awarded on a successful final demonstration of mastery for graduation--and exhibition, the tone of the school should explicitly and self consciously stress the values of unanxious expectation, of trust, and of decency, the principal and teachers should perceive of themselves first as generalists and next as specialists, [and] administrative and budget targets should not exceed by more than ten percent the budget at a traditional school (Sizer, 1992, pp. 207-208).

In Sizer's elaboration of the fourth principle above, he explained that decisions that encompass details concerning coursework, student work, teacher time requirements and the choice of pedagogical materials and methods "must be *unreservedly placed in the hands of the principal and staff*" (Sizer, 1996, p. 158, italics added). Other 'principles' have gained some attention in recent years, the most common of which include the institution of "democratic governance" and "respect and authority for students" (Sizer, 1996, p. 156). Having been persuaded by numerous elementary school officials to adapt CES principles for their purposes, Sizer (1996) established a list more commensurate with their needs, adding the essentials of considering developmentally appropriate (social and emotional) and child-centered instruction and close parental involvement

to the mix (pp. 158-159). The CES movement now encompasses over 1,000 schools. Thus, the three reform initiatives begun by these three educational leaders cover school grades from elementary to high school, including ASP networks limited to elementary schools and a few middle schools across the nation and LPS network primarily in the Southeast. We now turn our attention to the most recent ideas of these prominent reformers with particular attention to their relationship with the eight elements of community democracy.

Elements of Community Democratic Education[1]

Related to the formal democratic school reform structures, processes, and principles described above, is how the three school reformers' ideas, analyzed here, reflect particular elements of democracy. For example, what is their view of human nature? Do they believe all in the school community can participate? If so, in what ways? Can or should information be accessed and disseminated to ensure all are informed? What are these reformers' views on the nature of problems and knowledge in making the best educational decisions? A content analysis of the most recent books of Glickman (1998), Levin (Hopfenberg et al., 1993),[2] and Sizer (1996) in a previous study (Dixon, 1997) provided tentative answers to these questions among others. These texts reflect the different focuses of their authors: Sizer (Horace's Hope) compared CES with non-CES schools and included a section on reform policy; Glickman's text (Revolutionizing

---

[1]The content analysis in this section was conducted on three books: Revolutionizing America's Schools (Glickman, 1998); The Accelerated Schools Resource Guide (Levin, in Hopfenberg et al., 1993), and Horace's Hope (Sizer, 1996). See Dixon (1997) for methodological concerns.

[2]Dr. Henry Levin is the principal architect of the Accelerated Schools Project and the second author of The Accelerated Schools Resource Guide analyzed in this study. Thus, the ideas, though reflecting other authors, will be referred to here as principally Levin's.

America's Schools) focused on major themes that help to define what democracy means and described what he believes democratic schools should do and look like. He also analyzed race, gender, and other issues related to fairness, equality, fraternity, and liberty. Levin's work (The Accelerated Schools Resource Guide) was written to aid schools in developing a philosophy, process, and structure to implement the Accelerated Schools concept at their site. All made explicit the link between democracy and their reform ideas (Glickman, 1998, pp. 1, 4, 36; Levin, in Hopfenberg et al., 1993, pp. 33, 87; Sizer, 1996, pp. 74, 75, 145). This section highlights the ideas of the three reformers embedded in eight elements of democracy, beginning with their views on government.

Views on Government.[3] Sizer, Glickman, and Levin, all alluded to government activity in educational reform many times throughout their books, though it was not emphasized in Levin's (Levin, in Hopfenberg et al., 1993, p. 272). The following is a summary of their ideas followed by examples from their texts. The reformers emphasized community democratic beliefs about government (i.e., a general orientation that would reduce and shift the role of government and circumscribe its power in education policy while increasing the responsibilities of local collective decision making, especially those of teachers and parents who have an immediate interest in particular local schools). It is important to keep in mind that what differentiates liberal and community democratic conceptions is the relationship among the constellation of elements (belief about human nature, role of government, mode of participation, etc.) not merely agreement on

[3]The term government is defined here to include primarily elected officials, judges, or high level appointed policy makers. The author recognizes that teachers might be defined as government officials, but their employment is not secured through elections nor are they directly accountable to the electorate, an important distinction in the original study defining different conceptions of democracy.

one element such as beliefs about the role of government. Government, according to these reformers, should provide support (e.g., resources--monies, information) for the decisions of local schools, not dictate those decisions. 'Community' democratic reformers believe government should not play a large role in school decision making because they maintain that individuals, locally situated, have a greater capacity to participate, and will benefit by doing so, unlike the liberal democratic conceptualists, who have argued that only an elite can or should participate.

Specifically, Sizer, Glickman, and/or Levin argued that government is out of touch with school conditions and realities; too distant; unresponsive to or not solicitous of school personnel's ideas on needed reform; unrepresentative of a particular student population (the 'needy'); or beholden to special interests (advocates of students with disabilities or school personnel lobbies). For example, Levin wrote "Instead of simply complying with 'downtown' decisions made without staff input, accelerated school communities systematically define their own challenges and search out unique solutions that will work for them" (in Hopfenberg et al., 1993, pp. 17-18). Sizer demonstrated through his ideas that current priorities, efficiency or maximizing government control over schools, against values such as effective schooling defined by local school communities is problematic; government is not accountable nor responsive to what he considered to be the 'most relevant' school constituencies--families and school professionals in local schools; government reforms are not significant enough to ameliorate school problems; government heavy-handedness has resulted in consensual illegal and duplicitous activity by school personnel, which, in turn, has led to less effective school practices; government actions and policies should be more strictly circumscribed over education decisions. The following quotes from the reformers' texts reflect some of these beliefs.

> The fact remains that those most involved in the debate over public education appear to agree that the local and state board of education and the administrators who work for them, long entrusted with accountability, do not serve that function well.... A wise resolution will require a new balance of authority between families and government, with a significant tilt toward the former, and a respectful acknowledgment and accommodation of the diversity within our society. (Sizer, 1996, p. 38)

> [Views on the changes in types of schools in the future and choice] reflect the prevalent view that centralized government is an inept and inappropriate tool to set and shape the substance and standards of school policy and practice. They reflect the view that disproportional authority for these purposes should be given to the families affected and the professionals to whom those families entrust their children. Centralized government is needed as financier...as documenter, persuader, supporter, advocate for neglected children, truth-teller, but not, except at the extremes, a director. (Sizer, 1996, p. 141)

> Outside control over curricula disempowers schools and rules out considerations of what topics should be taught at what level, how they should be related to other topics, and to what degree of depth they should be taught.... [I]f democracy 'of the people' were taken earnestly, we would let individual schools decide within broad district, state, and national criteria. (Glickman, 1998, p. 44)

> School boards will need to shift their role to be more like educational Supreme Courts, deciding upon cases where democratic rights, responsibilities, and processes might have been violated. School districts and teachers' unions will need to provide services upon request to those schools already prepared to initiate democratic education, provide facilitation to those schools needing assistance to begin, and provide structure and regulations to those schools unaware or resistant to change. All efforts--judicial, facilitative, and directive--will need to aim at shifting the responsibility for the local, internal operations of schools from the district and state to individual schools, to the local educators, students, parents, and community members. *The role and voice of parents, more than any other group, should become the center of policies that will make democracy the serious business of schools.* (Glickman, 1998, p. 65, italics added)[4]

Sizer's statements, more so than Glickman's or Levin's, reflected an attachment to the values of individual liberty and rights, 'free' markets and competition, and meeting the diversity of

---

[4]There is some confusion in Glickman's writings about the power parents and teachers should wield in the decision making process (see, for example, his discussion of the weight given to the two groups in his writings, 1993, pp. 35,135; 1998, p. 65).

'community' needs. He claimed that governments' reach for efficiency through economy of scale reduced individual rights. Government action and sphere of control must be circumscribed to allow greater local school community control. Moreover, Sizer suggested that individual pursuit in a competitive market produced better results in schooling than government leaders consulting experts. The following quote reflected several of these ideas.

> [On the useful reforms to promote in American schools, contemporary] ideas reflect the belief that the market--involving competition and real choice among schools--is a better, if not complete or perfect, regulator of schooling than the traditional educational and political authorities and their experts allies in the teaching profession. [Like citizens in recent health c[illegible]re debate, parents say,] I wish to pick my children's school rather than have the state do the choosing. [Values such as meeting diverse community needs are] ill served by centralized control, which usually demands standardization. (Sizer, 1996, p. 142)

Glickman (1998) also proposed that local schools should be permitted time for planning and the flexibility to reorganize school schedules and working relationships (pp. 51-52); that school choice instead of government direction should guide student attendance decisions, within "equitable racial and socioeconomic balance" parameters (p. 67).

Sizer, Glickman, and Levin insisted that government was or could be helpful in some respects. For example, the courts should protect employee rights in unjust termination. The school board's function, according to Glickman, might be shifted to provide individual rights protection to school communities (p. 65). Moreover, Sizer demonstrated that a school board more favorable to CES reforms may be elected, though only after a good deal of effort is exerted and following some delay. Government, combined with private investment, can also provide valuable resources in curriculum, assessment, and standards-based reform (Sizer, 1996, pp. 46-47). Sizer also noted that government has played an important oversight role within our system (p. 144). And Levin

wrote that "Once the district office staff become part of the accelerated schools transformation" they enhanced the process, and could "endeavor to protect the risk taking in accelerated schools" (p. 273). Yet, the statements of the three reformers overwhelmingly suggested that government should not be involved deeply in educational policy, but that local school communities should have greater influence. Glickman (1998) emphatically stated that parents' voices should have primary authority over school direction (pp. 67-68), and Sizer (1996) maintained that principals and the school staff should have the greatest control (p. 159). Moreover, Glickman suggested that democratic educational decisions are those made by individuals directly and immediately affected by what goes on in schools.

Nature of Individuals and of the Masses. All three reformers believe strongly that individuals are shaped by their environment, and that everyone would benefit from greater opportunities to participate in decision making and school activities. Sizer (1996) noted that CES reforms can positively impact students, *en masse*, intellectually, morally, and socially. For example, when students are called upon to think "deeply" about topics (p. 86), required to take more responsibility for their learning--meaning they must be actively engaged, not passive, in learning--and required to publicly exhibit their understanding (p. 88), then they will learn the "habit" of using critical and creative thinking to "form reasoned judgments" (p. 88). CES schools also required similar traits from those who teach and supervise teachers in those schools. The effect, according to Sizer, was to produce a community of thinkers, who are motivated, interested, cooperative, and caring, and who can reach better decisions.[5] Sizer listed many of the

---

[5]Sizer (1996) also noted that in several CES schools there was some difficulty achieving positive results, either with students, the faculty, parents, or administration (pp. 59, 64, 79, 80-81, 136). Thus, Sizer was not as sanguine about human nature based on creating environmental

accomplishments of CES schools (from Harlem, to San Diego, to Conyers, Georgia), which have produced student achievement--on conventional and unconventional measures--significantly above what those schools produced previous to the CES reforms (pp. 19, 32, 54, 59, 79).

Levin and Glickman were more optimistic than Sizer about the prospects for improving individuals capacity to learn and govern themselves wisely through restructuring the school experience. Levin (in Hopfenberg et al., 1993) wrote, "Perceiving at-riskness as a human trait suggests that children are defective or in need of repair or remediation. But children are not the problem; at-riskness has to do with the situation in which we place children" (p. 9). He lamented the specialized and isolated work communities in schools (p. 22) and criticized that "parents feel left out and don't know how they can change things" (p. 13). Levin stated that ASP eliminated ability grouping, built school experiences around children's strengths, and held high expectations for all. These ASP practices, among others, contributed to "dramatic student achievement gains," declines in vandalism and expulsions, and led to increased parent participation at PTA meetings (pp. 18-19, 44).

Glickman (1998) pointed to empirical evidence that democratic school practices promoted "astonishing success in the intellectual achievement of all students" and helped individuals lead satisfying lives (p. 4). Moreover, he cited cognitive research that supports the claim that students who learn through democratic pedagogy "outdistance their peers in learning content, mastering basic skills, [and] achieving understanding and applications" (p. 25, 29). Democratic education, to Glickman, is partly, enlarging the circle of deci[illegible]making participation, acknowledging that everyone has valid and helpful resources to contribute, and valuing collaborative and cooperative

---

conditions as were Glickman or Levin.

work structures. Democratic education also encompasses "free expression [and] abundant dissemination of knowledge" (pp. 22-23). Glickman's reforms also reflect the importance of highlighting common interest over self interest (p. 5). The following quotes are examples of the types of statements the reformers made about individuals or 'the masses.'

> I have seen an explosion of energy in parents and local citizens in support of a new district high school in which they will have a respected role and which is designed with their particular children, rather than some stereotype of a child of a certain age (hatched in a remote office building), in mind. A sense of community responsibility is latent in many American neighborhoods, I have found, even those that are racked by poverty and crime or awash in entitlements of affluence. (Sizer, 1996, p. 138)

> In my own experience, I know of perceived 'slow' children who became incredibly intelligent, successful people. But they never would have excelled unless the adults around them had refused to accept the label given to them. Instead these adults treated them as having as much promise as anyone else. (Glickman, 1998, p. 48)

> Accelerated schools have high expectations for all children...have a vision and clear goals for making all children academically able...create powerful learning experiences to accelerate the progress of all children. (Levin, in Hopfenberg et al., 1993, p. 17)

Mode of Participation, Nature of Problems and Knowledge, and Information Access and Dissemination. These three elements of democracy are tightly linked to one another in the writing of the reformers, and it serves our purposes here only to demonstrate that linkage and note the community democratic nature of the three elements. All three reformers emphasized the important place that individual participation held in promoting increased personal capacity to govern wisely. But inclusive and widespread participation was necessary also to provide a better understanding of problems confronting society and to mine the minds of those individuals more directly and immediately affected by such problems. Problems, these reformers suggested, were rooted in experience and value orientations. Knowledge relevant to problem-solving was located in specific context--not merely or primarily in 'expertise' derived from outside sources (e.g.,

academia or government). Problems identified were connected to specific knowledge, which in turn, was perceived as intricately bound to values. Information was actively accessed by and disseminated to all in the process to find solutions. The 'school as a whole' could find common solutions.

Levin's ASP or Glickman's LPS processes reflect the linkage between universal participation, nature of problems and knowledge, and information exchange. The ASP process requires that everyone in the school community participates in several phases of decision making: "taking stock, forging a shared vision, setting priorities, and setting up school governance mechanisms" (Hopfenberg et al., 1993, pp. 56-57). The process also involves an inquiry ("Inquiry Process") to ascertain 'challenge' areas, potential causes of problems, alternative solutions, and assessment of the solution implemented (p. 49). A quote from The Accelerated Schools Resource Guide illustrates the connections between the ASP process and the community elements of democracy.

> One of the most notable and important changes in Burnett since it began the process of acceleration is the participation of the whole school community in making important decisions that will lead to their common vision. In all areas of the school, teachers, support staff, administrators, students, parents, and the local community are contributing their energies, opinions, and expertise to solve challenges confronting Burnett. [One participant reflected:]...it's the communication that makes everything happen. [The ASP] gave us a way of communicating...gave us a way of bringing all of the ideas of everyone together. (Levin, in Hopfenberg et al., 1993, p. 44).

Glickman and Sizer also advocated the need to increase participation in school decision making among those in the local community and to involve students more actively in their own learning. Sizer (1996) discussed the complexity of problems and knowledge, whether related to the fast pace change of American culture (p. 29), the complex and interconnected "high school mechanism" (p. 82), adolescents (p. 120), or value disagreements among Americans (pp. 110-

111). Such problems required an engaged citizenry that would apply its knowledge to the problems identified (p. 141). It also required, according to Sizer and Glickman, that citizens seek out and distribute information more readily (Sizer, pp. 120, 125, 144; Glickman, pp. 9, 29-30, 34). Sizer addressed the nexus between widespread participation, problems and knowledge, information exchange, and values in an effort necessary to reform schools.

> A better system could, for example, grow out of the alliance of individual schools--the students, teachers, parents, and neighbors--that share specific educational objectives, with these schools collaboratively designing and shaping what they collectively need at the top. That is, the initiative would come from the ranks rather than from the high-level planners. (Sizer, 1996, p. 69)

Reforms in classrooms would require students to participate more actively and responsibly too. Students, for example, should be required to act as mentors, to meet and brief visitors, or to produce a product for general consumption (e.g., media event) (Sizer, 1996, p. 20). Because societal problems are complex, traditional subject-centered studies are no longer appropriate. Therefore, students should be expected to engage in interdisciplinary problem solving (Sizer, 1996, p. 53).

Glickman (1998) emphasized that students should also learn by actively engaging problems in the community and by locating resources outside the school. Furthermore, he suggested that rather than using mimeographed sheets, workbooks, or textbooks, students should have access to "computers, telephones, literature, and reference materials" (pp. 37-38). Glickman proposed that "[democracy as a] powerful theory of education [included] the need for learners to actively participate in diffusing and constructing knowledge" (p. 9). To accomplish school wide reforms and democratic decision making, a "critical study process" (i.e., "action research") would provide a continual flow of relevant and local information to assess practices (p. 55). Thus, democratic

education entailed greater participation among students in classrooms and in the school community at-large, and widespread participation across these schools, which shaped how problems were defined, what knowledge was relevant, and an open exchange of information.

Expanse of Governance. Sizer also emphasized the role that small schools (population of schools or classrooms) plays in the democratic education reforms he advocated. Glickman agreed to a large extent, while Levin gave the topic scant attention. Schools, according to Sizer (1996), must be "human-scale places" (p. 91). Small-sized schools offered the best opportunity to realize democracy--creating caring and nurturing places and highly participatory communities in education decisionmaking, tackling problems collaboratively, sharing information among relevant constituencies, and producing students who can all excel in a variety of ways. Thus, small schools emphasized certain values, particularly community democratic values, over others. Sizer also distinguished between small size related to teacher-student relationships and responsibilities, and size connected to overall school populations; both promoted the best conditions for democratic learning. The statements included below reflect the importance and meaning Sizer attached to this element of democratic education.

> The faculty is small enough to find within itself a sense of community. That faculty and the principal have extraordinary freedom to shape their school in ways that they and their community want, rather than march to a standardized system developed elsewhere. This allows them, as a result, to narrow their work to essentials, to run a school so simple in its construction that it can bend to the needs of particular children. (Sizer, 1996, pp. 23-24)

> Bigness all too readily signals a need for order--crowd control, some call it--and order all too usually implies standardized routines and a rule driven, impersonal school culture. [Young adolescents] need much more than this, however, including sensitivity of a particular sort--sensitivity that recognizes and respects the extraordinary physical and emotional changes that most of them are experiencing. (Sizer, 1996, p. 31)

Importantly too, Sizer and Glickman praised small-sized schools and teacher-student ratios because they permit the establishment of personalized relationships and trust (Sizer, 1996, pp. 91-92; Glickman, 1998, p. 163). Moreover, Sizer (1996) implied that "small schools promoted higher achievement among students" (p. 94). And Glickman (1998) professed that small schools enabled the faculty "to sit together around the same table and make plans for and with their students" (p. 40); to plan opportunities for "team teaching;" to construct an interdisciplinary curriculum; and to develop "standards and reports of student performance" (p. 41). Glickman did caution, however, that small schools (together with school autonomy) did not automatically lead to "change or improved education," merely that it established the conditions "conducive to change" (p. 41). Levin (in Hopfenberg et al., 1993) noted that small schools "permit the individual attention that each student needs" (p. 12) and promote student connectedness "to the school family" (p. 41). He also asserted that a school with too many students may raise faculty concerns about discipline problems (p. 220) and negate effective communication in classroom activities as happened in an ASP school (p. 309).

Value Priorities. Overall, the works of the three reformers reflected that they cherished community democratic values, though Sizer's work reflected more a mixture of community and liberal democratic values. For example, Glickman and Levin, especially, stressed the values of widespread local school cooperation and collaboration in problem identification and solution, development of shared history and vision, the need to nurture others and school community (dilute status constraints), open dialogue, and local collective responsibility. Sizer also promoted many of these same values, with particular emphasis on 'human scale' places that permitted

personalization of in-school relationships. A few examples from their texts demonstrate several of these priories.

> Instead of simply complying with 'downtown' decisions made without staff input, accelerated school communities systematically define their own challenges and search out unique solutions that will work for them. (Levin, in Hopfenberg et al., 1993, pp. 17-18)

> [On implementing an ASP classroom exercise:] Establish an environment in your classroom in which multiple strengths and abilities [of students] are truly valued (Levin, in Hopfenberg et al., 1993, p. 31)

> [Levin explicitly states that 'in accordance with accelerated school values:'] The entire school community collaboratively works toward a shared purpose by meeting with, talking with, and learning from each others' experiences. (Levin, in Hopfenberg et al., 1993, p. 32)

> [In an interview with a principal implementing small school practices:] There can be an identification based on community that will not happen in a huge impersonal institution (where people are known by roles and status), not Paul, Carl and Christine.... (Glickman, 1998, p. 163)

> It is not only that each teacher must have a sensible load of students. It is that the school itself has to be of human scale--a place where everyone can know everyone else.... More than one teacher must know the child (and her family) well.... So much of importance in schools depends on trust, and trust arises from familiarity.... (Sizer, 1996, pp. 91-92)

Importantly, both Sizer and Glickman recognized the significance of some liberal democratic priorities such as competition, individualism, order and stability, or cost efficiency (see for example, Sizer, 1996, pp. 6, 15-16, 26, 30, 47, 115; Glickman, 1998, pp. 69, 90-92, 101, 132, 138). Too, some values that these reformers promoted did not fit within the conceptual scheme offered here (e.g., localism and nationalism) (Sizer, 1996, p. 43). But these democratic educational leaders' ideas fit most neatly within the community democratic conception. Now, we turn to contrasting liberal democratic elements rooted in the works of Publius.

Democracy in America

[T]he ultimate authority, wherever the derivative may be found, resides in the people alone, and that it will not depend merely on the comparative ambition or address of the different governments whether either, or which of them, will be able to enlarge its sphere of jurisdiction at the expense of the other. Truth, no less than decency, requires that the event in every case should be supposed to depend on the sentiments and sanction of their common constituents. James Madison, Federalist 46

Possibly the most forceful arguments for instituting the new American democratic-republic proposed in Philadelphia in 1787, and thus, the intellectual framework for American democracy, can be found in a series of newspaper editorials known as the Federalist Papers. These persuasive pieces, written under the pen name Publius, have come to be known as the thoughts of Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay, prominent advocates of the Constitution (Rossiter, 1961, pp. viii-xi). They reveal something of the nature of democracy that Americans at the time, who were allowed to participate politically, agreed to implement. It is my contention here that, even though the meaning of this document has undergone substantial revision and American society has changed, the Constitution's underlying principles, and the majority of its recommended processes, institutions, and structures, continue to pervade the present political system and that they contrast sharply with many of the ideas proffered by present-day community democratic school reformers described above. Such differences may impede adoption and implementation of these school reformers' ideas. This section discusses the *Federalist Papers* and some contemporary scholarship on the Constitution that touch on many elements of democracy advocated in current community democratic school reforms.

Before continuing, however, some caveats should be addressed: First, while it may be argued that the Constitution was (and is) a federal document, and thus, has little implications for schools,

school practice, or school governance (civil rights aside), this clearly is misleading. The men in Philadelphia were attempting to construct a system that permitted, indeed, safe-guarded, self governance. The school reformers evaluated here, and elsewhere (Dewey, 1916; Gutmann, 1987; Westbrook, 1996; Wood, 1992), see this too as a primary purpose of schools and/or as an apt operative theory of school practice and decision making. Furthermore, most states modeled their own constitutions after the U.S. Constitution (or vice versa) (see Federalist 39, 47, 69, 81) based on similar philosophical or historical underpinnings, and of course, states share the primary constitutional responsibility for education. Critics may also point to the substantive and historical differences between self governance for a nation in its infancy ("In a country chiefly consisting of the cultivators of land," Rossiter, p. 369) and self governance in schools today. Indeed, there are significant differences between military policy to prevent threats from external invasion and policy to enrich public schools while threatened by private competition. But there is also an infinite variety of policies (i.e., values) with which both institutions must be concerned, and there is common attributes to be compared about what mechanism is used to institute policies and who participates. Both schools and elected governments are ultimately concerned with questions of power, how it is distributed, who has influence and why, and what values are trumpeted as most worthy. Thus, the one enables us to understand better the other. Moreover, as Hyland (1995) recommended, this study helps us to construct a scheme to better evaluate whether one democratic conception may produce different and particularly desirable outcomes than another (p. 68).

It also may be argued that while schools nominally fall under state constitutional protection and obligation, they are principally the wards of and controlled by the local community,

particularly the local school board through the delegation of power by state governments. This is a more intriguing proposition, and one worth exploring more fully since school boards operate not solely in legislative ways, but also, executive and judicial, through their powers to dismiss chief executives (superintendents) and other personnel in school districts or to limit citizen rights. Therefore, they function in a unique power arrangement not imitated in American constitutional government. In fact, Madison (Federalist 47) stated that this informal power arrangement was the "very definition of tyranny" (Rossiter, p. 301). Also, the deference accorded to 'local control' has so colored the rights of states or the national government to intervene in educational decisions that it is an informal rival to other Constitutional values, procedures, institutions, or structures. The issue of power relationships surrounding school reform, therefore, opens numerous possibilities for research and discussion about restructuring school decision making, in classrooms, schools, or school districts, in line with democratic purpose. This research explored the writings of Publius because of its connection with the intellectual and practical framework upon which American democracy still rests.

Publius[6]

Rossiter (1961) has noted that Publius was especially concerned about anarchy and instability in the confederation of American states, and thus, sought to remedy these problems through "federalism, social pluralism, and constitutionalism (that is, divided, balanced, and limited government)" (p. xiv). These components of the new American democracy were devised to circumvent or control the weaknesses of human nature (moral, emotional, and intellectual), to prevent outcomes thought to be produced by majority rule ('mobocracy') or small-town provincial

[6]Rossiter (1961) is the source for all references to Publius discussed in this section.

rule, and to protect individual liberty. Rossiter maintained that the founding fathers believed no values in the American democratic hierarchy were as important as stability and order, if only because they were instrumental to promote happiness, liberty, self-government, constitutionalism, and morality (p. xvi). Thus, one could argue that these men believed that instrumental values preceded, and therefore, took precedence over other end values, at least in terms of the realization of the latter. The democratic 'how to' and particular institutions and structures were critical to achieve the desired democratic ends. Publius' discussion of these ideas contrasts sharply with those described above in the three community democratic school movements, whether comparing process, structures, institutions, or value priorities.

One of the most notable and substantial differences between Publius and the three school reformers is how each viewed power and its potential for misuse (Rossiter, 1961, p. 111). This is reflected in an emphasis on how decisions should be made and by whom. Publius appeared particularly interested in dispersing power through separate institutions that share functions but are controlled or held accountable through separate power bases (constituencies). These advocates of the Constitution also saw the overlapping national and state structure (federalism) as a check on power, albeit recommending that the national government have the upper hand. Moreover, territorial and population expanse permitted the selection of more refined powerbrokers not tied to local or parochial interests nor predisposed to collusion with the same, again checking potential for abuse of power arising from self interest. Elections fit prominently in the selection of office-holders, at once, promoting virtue and accountability to the people. Elections provided for the legal transfer of power, from the people to the representative. Participation in elections was the principal activity of the general public in self governance, not

continuous participation in public affairs. The power of the state was controlled through the people's vote at periodic intervals. And elections, themselves, were spaced so to disconnect personal aspirations of office-holders and their public pursuits or to prevent the coordination of ambition and public pursuit among a 'cabal.' Bicameralism and a distinct role for the Senate were among other devices to disperse power, yet provide the country with disinterested and prudent policy making.

Many of the founding fathers' concerns with power are related to the eight elements of the liberal democratic conception identified below. The founders advocated a particular conception of democracy related to their beliefs about human nature, government, proper mode of participation, information access and dissemination, the nature of problems and knowledge, the necessary expanse of rule, and value priorities. Many sections of the Federalist Papers speak directly to these elements of democracy. It is to these considerations that we turn next.

Nature of Individuals and of the Masses. Madison, Hamilton, and Jay, all cautioned that human nature worked against establishing a widely participatory system of governance, in which the masses would do much more than vote, and individuals who wielded power could do so without legal restraint. At the time, of course, even voting was widely circumscribed. Publius' notion of human depravity can be located in numerous quotes similar to the following expressed by Hamilton, "The supposition of universal venality in human nature is little less an error in political reasoning than the supposition of universal rectitude" (p. 458). The root of the 'human problem' was described as stemming from multiple sources--intrapsychic needs and personal aggrandizement to the protection of personal property, the result of unequal ability (p. 78). Hamilton intoned that some of "the cause[s] of hostility" operating on society emanated from the

general problems of "love of power or the desire for pre-eminence and dominion--the jealousy of power, or the desire of equality and safety... [or others,] which take their origin entirely in private passions; in the attachments, enmities, interests, hopes, and fears of leading individuals in the community of which they are members" (p. 54).

Madison, in his celebrated Federalist 10, wrote to the sources of human frailty when describing the best form of government as that which permitted representation based on selection by election of virtuous representatives. The representatives would be the best the country could offer because they would be identified, not on the basis of local prejudice and parochial self interest, but by (and from) an expansive electorate across many miles. In this framework, Madison wrote, the public views would be refined (p. 82). Furthermore, the totality of representatives would be kept to a minimum "to guard against the confusion of the multitude" (p. 82). Even more telling, Madison went on to exclaim that if the representative was chosen by a great number of citizens, then "it will be more difficult for unworthy candidates to practice with success the vicious arts by which elections are too often carried" (p. 82). And Jay added that the virtues of a national government could be clearly seen over the then confederation of states because it would employ men with "more general and extensive reputation for talents and other qualifications" (p. 43).

Government organization, control over policy domains, and various methods for election were also connected to Publius' dour views of human nature. As Madison relayed, "Ambition must be made to counteract ambition," and "If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary" (p. 322). Government structures, thus, had to be divided, and were so, in several ways (e.g., three branches sharing power, bicameralism, and federalism). Also, different government

agencies shared policy making roles, yet their method of election or appointment derived from separate sources (local, state, or national electorate). Duration in office and rotation by election also varied to permit no cabals from forming. Policy dominance was assigned to different branches of government, the House of Representatives would, for instance, initiate revenue measures, while the President and the Senate would confer over treaty making. Moreover, checks of one over the other provided some measure of oversight.

Hamilton and Madison also alluded to the general weaknesses of human nature in other discussions on the constitution. For example, Madison explained the necessity that only a select few participate in the constitutional convention in Philadelphia: "The history of almost all the great councils and consultations held among mankind for reconciling their discordant opinions, assuaging their mutual jealousies and adjusting their respective interests, is a history of factions, contentions, and disappointments, and may be classed among the firmities and depravities of the human character" (p. 231). Madison also argued that the people should be resorted to only infrequently in constitutional questions because of the likelihood of disturbing the "public passions" (p. 315). Hamilton boasted of the importance of rotating terms at unequal intervals in the Senate to eliminate the possibility of "sinister designs" (p. 365). Moreover, Publius stated its concern over human nature by extolling the virtues of the electoral college, "A small number of persons, selected by their fellow-citizens from the general mass, will be most likely to possess the information and discernment requisite to so complicated an investigation. It was also peculiarly desirable to afford as little opportunity as possible to tumult and disorder" (p. 412). How the electors would meet and vote also lent itself to avoiding the likely convulsion of their meeting together. Hamilton connected the independence necessary for judicial officers to avoid "a

disposition to consult popularity," instead of the "code of laws" (p. 171). Finally, Publius believed that "trial by jury" would serve to check corruption, by judges no less than sheriffs or clerks of the court (pp. 500-501).

Views on Government. Publius supported the adoption of the constitution principally because of widespread fears concerning the weaknesses of the Articles of Confederation (Rossiter, p. xii).[7] The states in the Confederacy were able to treat tax, commercial, and other national or interstate concerns with impunity. Rebels were inciting trouble in the countryside (e.g., Shays's Rebellion). States were squabbling over disputes between them, and the nation was thought to be vulnerable to foreign exploitation. A new federal government, therefore, would be needed to achieve goals of greater unity and provide more ably for the common good in a limited number of policy areas (see for example, Federalists 6, 7, 15). Publius specifically argued that government had to be reconstructed and strengthened to perform certain functions to pave the way to achieve highly prized values such as protection of property or other rights, maintenance of stability and order, provision of justice and liberty, among others. A national government was also needed to mediate disputes among factions, including state governments.

To Hamilton, the word government implied "the power to make law," attended with sanctions for those who violated those laws (p. 110). "Why [Hamilton asked,]has government been instituted at all? Because the passions of men will not conform to the dictates of reason and justice without constraint. Has it been found that bodies of men act with more rectitude or greater disinterestedness than individuals? The contrary of this has been inferred by all accurate observers of the conduct of mankind" (p. 110).

---

[7]See Beard (1913) and Zinn (1995) for alternative views on the framers' motives.

Of course, Publius was also well aware of the necessary limits to be placed on government and the importance of consent of the people (see the arguments presented in the last section).[8] Elections were critical in this equation. For example, elections were to be held frequently for members of the House of Representatives, which passed revenue laws (p. 357). Madison claimed, too, that biennial elections were necessary to promote freedom from government tyranny and responsiveness to the electorate, and to permit the legislator time to master minimal levels of knowledge pertaining to legislation (pp. 332, 351). The national government would also have to share power with state governments and admit that the powers not expressedly given to itself, or reserved to the states, would remain with the people

While Publius maintained that the chief object of government was to "protect property" (p. 78; justice and liberty were also mentioned elsewhere), these writers believed that government could do so only by being permitted to perform other functions or by acquiring the requisite power, the most critical of which included collecting taxes. Hamilton emphasized the point: "A complete power, therefore, to procure a regular and adequate supply of revenue, as far as the resources of the community will permit, may be regarded as an indispensable ingredient in every constitution (p. 188). With steady and secure sources of revenue, then, the government could pursue other "necessary and proper" functions (p. 201).

Publius also described the characteristics of a superior government. Specifically, good government was thought to be energetic, stable, efficient, responsive to the public (yet responsible), and accountable to the electorate (Federalist 70). To achieve such a government, Hamilton maintained that the executive must be a single actor (p. 424). A lone executive would

---

[8]See Wood (1969), pp. 519-564 for a discussion on the issue of the people as sovereign.

permit government to act coherently, speedily, secretly (especially necessary in foreign affairs), and actively. The people would also be able to attach responsibility to government more easily. Accountability could be maintained, as well, through electoral mandate. Contrarily, constructing a plural executive would confound such features: For example, Hamilton lamented, "it tends to conceal faults and destroy responsibility" (p. 427). He also maintained that "an artful cabal in [a plural executive] would be able to distract and to enervate the whole system of administration" (p. 427).

Mode of Participation, Nature of Problems and Knowledge, and Information Access and Dissemination. As with the community democratic conception described above, a clear connection can be made among liberal democratic elements noted in Publius' writings. In the public realm, a small number of 'virtuous' leaders were expected to tackle complex problems because they were believed to have the requisite knowledge, virtue, and patriotic zeal--and necessary distance from local interests. The masses would participate only rarely at election time, if at all (e.g., Senators elected by state legislators; presidential electoral college). The number of elected representatives in the legislature would also be limited, as Madison noted, because the larger number in the assembly, "the fewer will be the men who in fact direct their proceedings," "the greater is known to be the ascendancy of passion over reason," [and] "the greater will be the proportion of members of limited information and of weak capacities.... Ignorance will be the dupe of cunning, and passion the slave of sophistry and declamation" (p. 360; see also Madison's commentary on the Senate, p. 379). Governing representatives, chosen from a vast expanse of territory to represent a multitude of constituents, would assure the most virtuous and disinterested leaders (pp. 82-83), and these conditions would assure "greater knowledge and more

comprehensive information" (p. 175). The problems identified and the knowledge to solve them would not be rooted in local prejudice or in the interests of an overbearing majority, but in pursuit of the public good by enlightened representatives (p. 83).

Qualifications to gain Senate or Presidential offices included attaining the age of thirty-five so that men of experience and knowledge would guide the long term interests of the nation. Elected officials in the legislature and executive branch were to serve two, six, and four years in duration so as to be able to master the necessary knowledge to perform well the public business. Members of the House of Representatives, for example, would be required to acquire expertise on "commerce, taxation, and the militia," among the various states (pp. 347-348). Senators, too, were expected to learn "the objects and principles of legislation," or its laws, affairs, and the broad "interests of the country" (p. 379). Madison noted, concerning decisions at the Constitutional Convention, that information was best exchanged among the few than among the masses due to "indistinctness of the object [division of governing responsibilities], imperfection of the organ of conception, [and] inadequateness of the vehicle of ideas (p. 229). Judicial officers were kept independent from the legislative branch because the former were to be selected "for their knowledge of the laws, acquired by long and laborious study" and to resolve disputes away from local prejudices (p. 483).

Expanse of Governance. Publius also elaborated extensively on the benefits of governance that encompassed vast territories and populations, and on the defects of a limited sphere of rule. Some of the positives have been discussed above such as the election of more virtuous leaders or decision making that promoted the general good, greater potential for unity and less opportunity for destructive factions (pp. 47, 74-75, 82-84, 369). Majority tyranny was also thought to be

difficult to achieve if the governing territory and population were extensive since a few factions could not combine to dominate the governed (Federalist 10, 51). Jay also maintained that better coordination, consistency of purpose and action, greater resources, the "enactment of uniform principles" to guide action, and the characteristics that "harmonize, assimilate, and protect the several parts and members, and extend its benefits and foresight to each" were derived from the larger construction of union; Hamilton added that efficiency and economy would also be the result (p. 14).

Value Priorities. The list of values promoted by Publius was extensive. Nevertheless, there is little doubt that liberty, defined as protection from tyranny (especially government), was highly prized. The preceding discussion of other elements of democracy suggested as much. Happiness was partly secured through liberty. In fact, how government was to be structured, its powers and functions defined and circumscribed, the desired type of participation prescribed, the leaders selected, and territory and population encompassed in governance, point to a list of highly prioritized values advocated by Publius. Government was to provide security (protection of property and other rights), stability, order, executive energy, uniformity, responsible policy and action, and accountability to the public (pp. 14, 229, 281-283, 301, 377-379, 381, 414).[9] Achieving a "sense of national character" also fit in the list of values (p. 383).

Implications for Community Democratic School Reformers

This study presented two contrasting conceptions of democracy, community and liberal. The liberal conception presented here reflects the ideas and ideals of prominent founding fathers of the

---

[9]Feldman (1993) has also emphasized the present-day Constitutional value of security, and adds efficiency to the list (p. 238).

U.S. Constitution in writings known as the Federalist Papers. The community conception encompasses views embedded in recent works of three current democratic school reformers, among others. Comparing the liberal and community conceptions suggests that reforming schools for democratic purpose or to reflect an underlying democratic theory is complex. This is so because the nature of democracy, itself, is often described and practiced in contradictory ways.

The conceptions of democracy described here were compared across several elements including beliefs about the nature of individuals and of the masses, government, participation, information access and dissemination, the nature of problems and knowledge, expanse of governance, and value priorities. The conclusions one makes about these different elements has implications for how schools make decisions and educate students. Theoretically speaking, if school officials adopt LPS, ASP, or CES--all described here as community democratic reforms--individuals within those schools are thought to be capable of and willing to make decisions, many times, now made by administrators. Also administrators are thought to be willing and able to permit such participatory decision making. The school staff is also expected to use research processes to address issues openly, controversial or otherwise. Teachers, among others, are believed to have appropriate levels of knowledge and motivation, and the necessary personality type, to contribute to collective decision making about school-wide functions, from curriculum to staffing and hiring, budgeting, and assessment. These participants are believed to want for everyone's children what they wish for their own. The school staff and community representatives are expected to work collaboratively and cooperatively to identify and prioritize common problems, to explore causes of those problems, and to seek solutions based on extensive information diffusion, and to reach consensus on solutions.

The community democratic conception also maintains that problems are rooted in local circumstance (i.e., knowledge and values), and thus must be solved through local action, not solely or mostly with expertise external to the school. Thus, state legislatures, school boards, and/or the officials in central district offices should primarily support local school decision making by providing monies, expertise, or arbitration--in cases of possible rights violations; they are not to impose decisions on schools. Small schools are thought to serve students best because such conditions allow for personalization, flexibility, innovation, the development of community, and collaborative and cooperative operations and decision making. These products and processes are embraced as value priorities by community democratic conceptualists. Student learning in the classroom should also reflect many of these same beliefs and practices--active participation by children, belief that students are capable and willing to participate in educational decisions, expansive opportunities to access and disseminate information, and so forth.

A critical appraisal of many of the community democratic elements compared to those described by Publius and operating currently in the American democratic system, however, suggests that reforms such as LPS, CES or ASP, as currently constructed, are doomed to failure or to limited success at best. Publius' writings are especially valuable in light of the lessons they provide about the obstacles community democratic school reformers face when attempting to implement their principles, processes, and governance mechanisms. Several of these insights are discussed here. Most significantly, Publius maintained that Americans highly value accountability, responsiveness, liberty (from government or from a parochial majority), order, stability, competition, and the protection of prerogatives, which many believe to be the product of unequal natural talent or effort. Vast current inequalities in American educational expenditures between

rich and poor school districts reflects the highly prized value many Americans impute to protection of prerogative (Kozol, 1991).

Publius also emphasized accountability and responsiveness functions that elections serve. These elections, unlike those promoted by the community democratic reformers, have consequences for power relationships. In other words, elections determine who has power to make decisions that are legally sanctioned. Internal school elections, contrarily, have no legal foundation, and may have little consequence for those defeated. Internal school elections also do not ensure success for a policy agreed upon by consensus since legal authorities may block their implementation. Furthermore, the school principal, who usually serves as a permanent member on the elected school-wide representative council, is accountable to the school board, not the faculty.[10]

Publius argued, too, that participation in elections should be limited because the masses do not possess the expertise to contribute to policy making decisions. Applied to schools, reformers must ask whether the school staff, or others (parents), have the expertise to decide questions of school spending, staffing and hiring, or curriculum development. Another related question is whether faculty, staff, or administrators have the necessary grasp of research technique or methodology to execute and/or evaluate "action research" (LPS) or the "inquiry process" (ASP)? Under the U.S. Constitutional scheme, elected officials were permitted at least two, and as much

---

[10]Cook (1992) has elaborated an "instrumental view" of public administrators, which entails their primary responsibility to elected officials, in contrast to a "constitutive" role debated at the Constitutional Convention of 1787. Burke (1989) also pointed to the responsibility of public administrators to elected public policy makers, even as they protect broader democratic frameworks. Finer (1941) has argued that responsibility to elected officials by public administrators is the very definition of democratic administration, and takes precedence over the notion of responsibility to professional standards.

as six (Senators), years in office to master legal subjects to ensure the most knowledgeable decision making. Electing good leaders was believed to be possible if chosen from a large population across an expanse of territory. This limited the problematic nature of parochial factions tyrannizing decision making and individuals or making mischief. Publius also contended that the masses do not work well as a collectivity due to emotional, intellectual, or moral inadequacies. Moreover, individuals are thought to be prone to dependence on strong, capable leaders. These ideas are reflected in the governance structures that Americans currently rely upon, and believe in, to govern themselves, but are contrary to many of the ideas embedded in the community democratic school reforms. The contrasts between community and liberal democratic elements of democracy elaborated in this research provides evidence that current reforms such as LPS, ASP, CES, as presently conceived may face insurmountable obstacles. They may also suggest that legal school governance structures should be amended to more adequately reflect either a liberal or a community democratic conception if researchers are to adequately investigate comparisons between the two on specific measures of school effectiveness.

Bibliography

Beard, C. (1913). An economic interpretation of the constitution of United States. New York: MacMillan.

Burke, J.P. (1989). Reconciling public administration and democracy: The role of the responsible administrator. Public Administration Review, 49(2), 467-472.

Cook, B.J. (1992). Subordination or independence for administrators? The decision of 1789 reexamination. Public Administration Review, 52(5), 497-503.

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education. New York: The Free Press.

Dixon, D. A. (1998). Conceptions of democracy: Elements for a theory of school political culture. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Dixon, D.A. (1997). Conceptions of democracy and school reform: A systematic analysis of prominent democratic education reformers' ideas. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens.

Dryzek, J.S. (1996). Political inclusion and the dynamics of democratization. American Political Science Review, 90(1), 475-487.

Feldman, D. (1993). Introduction: Public administration and the constitution. Public Administration Review, 53(3), 237-239.

Finer, H. (1941). Administrative responsibility in democratic government. Public Administration Review, 1(4), 335-350.

Glickman, C.D. (1998). Revolutionizing America's Schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Glickman, C.D. (1993). Renewing America's schools: A guide for school-based action. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gutmann, A. (1987). Democratic education. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hopfenberg, W.S., Levin, H.M., Chase, C., Christensen, S.G., Moore, M., Soler, P., Brunner, I., Keller, B., and Rodriguez, G. (1993). The accelerated schools resource guide. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hyland, J.L. (1995). Democratic theory: The philosophical foundations. New York: Manchester University Press.

Kerr, D.H. (1996). Democracy, nurturance, and community. In R. Soder (Ed.), Democracy, education, and the schools (pp. 37-68). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kozol, J. (1991). Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools. New York: Crown Publishers.

Putnam, R.D. (1995). Tuning in, tuning out: The strange disappearance of social capital in America. American Political Science Review, 28(4), 664-683.

Rohr, J.A. (1987). The administrative state and constitutional principle. In R.C. Chandler (Ed.). A centennial history of the American administrative state (pp. 113-159). New York: Macmillan.

Rossiter, C. (Ed.). (1961). The federalist papers: Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, John Jay. New York: New American Library.

Sizer, T.R. (1996). Horace's hope: What works for the American high school. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Sizer, T.R. (1992). Horace's school: redesigning the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Truman, D.B. (1951). The governmental process: Political interests and public opinion. (2nd ed.). New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

VanSickle, R.L. (1983). Practicing what we teach: Promoting democratic experiences in the classroom. In M.A. Hepburn (Ed.), Democratic education in schools and classrooms (pp. 49-66). Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.

Westbrook, R.B. (1996). Public schooling and American democracy. In R. Soder (Ed.), Democracy, education, and the schools (pp. 125-150). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wood, G.H. (1992). Schools that work: America's most innovative public education program. New York: Penguin Books.

Wood, G.S. (1969). The creation of the American republic: 1776-1787. New York: W.W. Norton.

Yankelovich, D. (1991). Coming to public judgment: Making democracy work in a complex world. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Zinn, H. (1995). A people's history of the United States: 1492-present. New York: HarperCollins.

Appendix[11]

Table 1

Elements of the Liberal Conception of Democracy

Elements of Conceptions	Research Conclusions	Research Sources[12]
Nature of Individuals and Masses	No common will; ignorant and unmotivated to learn outside area of interest or experience; limited capacity to understand real world complexity—proclivity to distort based on personal experience and values; prone to unreflective, passionate action; apathetic; reactive, not proactive; psychological need for authoritarian leaders; need for stability, coherence, and simplicity; incompetence unremediable; unequal; selfish, whimsical	Schumpeter, 1976; Lippmann, 1922, 1925; Berelson, Sartori, and Eckstein, cited in Pateman, 1970; Shaver and Larkins, 1973; Schattschneider, 1960; Downs, 1957; Adams, cited in Shaw, 1976; Madison and Hamilton, cited in Rossiter, 1961; Hayek, 1960; Locke, cited in Laslett, 1960; Plato and Machiavelli, cited in Held, 1987

[11]The following Tables are taken from Dixon (1997).

[12]The researchers listed here do not all subscribe necessarily to all the characteristics listed in any particular element. However, the combination of characteristics is useful to distinguish between different conceptions of democracy and to build a theoretical model for each based on general orientations (e.g., emphasis on nature versus nurture in human development).

Views on Government[13]	Negative; limited scope (free markets emphasized); freedom threatening; primary role—protection of Constitutional rights and private property; necessary primarily for community decision making (establish laws) and execution of laws	Hayek, 1944; Locke, cited in Laslett, 1960; Madison, cited in Rossiter, 1961; Montesquieu, cited in Held, 1987
Information Access and Distribution	Limited due to experiential constraints, complexity, time constraints, potential for misinterpretation, bounded social relationships, protection of self or community interests or of cherished values or beliefs, competition, cultural norms (ideology of privacy)	Lippmann, 1922, 1925; Downs, 1957; Schattschneider, 1960; Schumpeter, 1976
Mode of Participation	Highest level of participation in government decision making (and in competition to rule) limited to political and expert elites; mass participation limited to elections, primarily voting and discussion around ideas proposed by elites; ideology of limited public sphere, organizational complexity, costs of participation, and procedural rules on governing scope lead to elite rule; two party system limits scope of issues considered and influence	Schumpeter, 1976; Berelson, Sartori, and Eckstein, cited in Pateman, 1970; Schattschneider, 1960; Downs, 1957; Madison, cited in Rossiter, 1961; Plato, cited in Held, 1987

[13]The term government was defined in this study to include only elected officials and court judges or justices. While one can argue that the term government might include all state employees (e.g., teachers or others in public schools), the rationale here is that only those officials intricately involved in political elections and or party politics, and who have legal standing to make, or to interpret the constitutionality of law, represent the state in the strictest sense. Elected officials, in turn, are legally accountable and responsive to the general public, at least in theory. Moreover, judges and justices are required to be responsive to laws made by those elected officials, and are accountable for this to continue in office. The author recognizes that this distinction in terminology is somewhat tenuous but legitimate and helpful for the purposes of this analysis.

Nature of Problems and Knowledge	Problems are complex, thus, decision making limited to experts (specialized knowledge, emphasis on technical rationality, value neutrality); problems rooted in values and citizens disagree on value priorities , thus, decision making limited to elites who compete to promote limited range of value priorities; problems simplified by electoral organization and definition; knowledge is tied to science or disciplinary perspective	Lippmann, 1922, 1925; Schattschneider, 1960; Downs, 1957; Locke, cited in Laslett, 1960; Madison, cited in Rossiter, 1961; Schumpeter, 1976: Wilson, 1887
Size of Territory or Population	Large sphere of rule (combined with elected representation) prevents tyranny; large sphere of rule protects heterogeneous views and values; large sphere promotes election of virtuous, disinterested leaders	Madison, cited in Rossiter, 1961; Dahl, cited in Pateman, 1970
Value Priorities	Freedom from government ("liberty"); limited scope of government; individualism; system stability; order; security; competition; private property; Constitution law tied to freedom from government	References in elements cited previously in Table 1

Table 2

Elements of the Community Conception of Democracy

Elements of Conceptions	Research Conclusions	Research Sources
Nature of Individuals and Masses	Shaped by the environment (e.g., economic self sufficiency, opportunities to participate and to be educated, non discriminatory or repressive laws); individuals and society can reach increased levels of intellectual, skill, and moral development, become more responsible, more capable and confident to participate, more considerate of the interests of all (recognizing interdependence or common good); environment is shaped by wide-ranging types of institutions ("associations") (e.g., families, churches, schools)	Rousseau and Wollstonecraft, cited in Held, 1987; Cole, cited in Pateman, 1970; VanSickle, 1979, 1983; Dewey, 1916; Barber, 1988; Kerr, 1996; Gutmann, 1987; Paley, 1995; Apple and Beane, 1995
Views on Government	Neutral or emphasized less than inclusive private associations	Dewey, 1916; Dryzek, 1996; Barber, 1988; Putnam, 1995
Information Access and Distribution	Limited only by relevancy to problem solving and individual privacy considerations	Hyland, 1995; Marx, cited in Held, 1987; Cole, cited in Pateman, 1970; Held, 1987; Thoreau, 1849/1993, 1854/1993, 1859/1993; Gutmann, 1987; Dewey, 1916; Kerr, 1996
Mode of Participation	Equal effective rights for all affected by decisions to participate (quantitative and qualitative)—including maximizing total participation throughout four "moments" of decision making (agenda setting, deliberation, choice, and implementation); collaborative participation of experts and general public through committees or public forums; problem solving collaboration across demographic and social groups	Hyland, 1995; Marx, cited in Held, 1987; Rousseau and Cole, cited in Pateman, 1970; Dewey, 1916; Barber, 1988; VanSickle, 1979, 1983; Kerr, 1996; Apple and Beane, 1995

Nature of Problems and Knowledge	Problems are complex; their solutions are rooted in technical knowledge, knowledge of local circumstance and individual experience, and local community value priorities	Yankelovich, 1991; Paley, 1995; VanSickle, 1979; Kerr, 1996
Size of Territory or Population	Small size permits opportunities for personalization and nurturance, common understanding, problem solving and collaboration, open dialogue, flexibility	Dewey, 1916; Meier, 1995; VanSickle, 1979; Kerr, 1996
Value Priorities	Non-government collective action; shared understanding, open dialogue, cooperative and collaborative problem-solving across demographic and social groups; dilution of status constraints on collaboration (emphasis on equality); development of common history, and nurturing others and community	References cited previously in Table 2